

April 20, 1983

LB 169

ought to read the bill. There is nothing about three to seven in the bill. The bill says 3%. My motion is to put the bill back for an amendment to change it to six. Apparently John DeCamp is in favor of seven. I think six is a reasonable figure. Had we had this figure we wouldn't be doing all the interfund borrowing that we are doing in this state and I just believe that it is time for us to say we are going to be responsible people on this floor and we are going to change that figure to 6% so that we can carry out our responsibilities.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The question is the adoption of the Howard Peterson amendment. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Have you all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 17 ayes, 23 nays, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The motion fails. Do you have anything else on the bill?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Lamb would move to return the bill for a specific amendment, that amendment being to strike the enacting clause.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Lamb. Senator Lamb, if you would allow me first, there are several guests that I would like to introduce on behalf of all Omaha senators. In the North balcony are 22 ladies, Women of Chamber of Commerce in the Omaha delegation. David Smalheiser is with them. He is the aide to Senator Higgins. Then in addition to that, Senator Chronister has guests by way of 9 seniors of Snyder High School at Snyder, Nebraska, and they are the Government class. Alan Harms is their teacher. Would you please rise and be welcomed by your Legislature. Thank you. Thank you, Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I realize that I am blowing in the wind and I think you will all agree that it is not often that I take this procedural method of making a point and I do it today only because I feel so very strongly that the passage of LB 169 would be a mistake. Now it has been suggested that the bill has partisan overtones and that may be true. It has been suggested that the passage of the bill is linked with the passage of other bills and that very well may be true and it may be linked with some bills in which I have an interest, but I have to take that risk, that chance because I do feel strongly about the issue. My only reason for opposing LB 169 is that I believe that state spending will skyrocket if the determination of tax rates is made in obligation of the Legislature and taken from the State Board of Equalization and that